Item Worksheet—Item 7.1

Prepare one Item Worksheet for each Item, capturing the 6–10 most important strengths and opportunities for improvement based on the applicant's response to the Criteria requirements and its key business/organization factors.

Indicate the 4–6 most important key business/organization factors relevant to this Item.

(Use the mouse or arrow keys to move to a new key factor. Hitting the Return key will generate an additional number.)

1. Academic programs: elementary, middle, and high school programs
2. Key student segments: regular, special education, ESL, ESP, LCC, and NCS; student demographics: 3.5% Asian, 31% black, 11.2% Hispanic, 3.3% Native American/other, 51% white, 45% disadvantaged (Region 3 highest disadvantaged, 71%)
3. Student and stakeholder requirements/key success factors (KSFs): academic excellence; high-quality curricula and instruction; friendly, supportive, and safe learning environment; effective support services; and effective and efficient fiscal management and operations (Figure P.1-2)
4. Sources of competitive and comparative data: ASDE, ASBE, USEA, United States Assessment of Educational Progress (USAEP), Anywhere Assessment of Educational Progress (AAEP), Scholastic and Predictive Aptitude Tests (SAT and PSAT, respectively), Education Survey Consortium (ESC), United State School Business Officers (USSBO), and Junoflower Consortium
5. Strategic challenge—Education/learning: Be agile and respond to changing performance expectations such as those mandated by NCLB; address poverty-based gaps in levels of readiness to learn
   Operational: integrate technology as a learning tool
6. Vision, mission, and values

Include an indication of the relative importance/strength of the comment by using ++ or - - as appropriate.

Include a reference to the most relevant key factor(s).

Include an indication of which results evaluation factors are addressed in this comment (refer to page 6 in the full version of the scorebook):

Le = Performance Levels T = Trends C= Comparisons Li = Linkage G = Gap

(Use Ctrl Tab to move to the next column within the comment field; Use the Rtn or Enter key to begin a new comment.)

+/++	Item Ref.	KF Ref.	Le/T/ C/Li	Strengths (Include figure references, as appropriate.)
++	a	1-6	Le,T,C	The district demonstrates continuously improving student performance in the United States Assessment of Educational Progress (USAEP) 4th grade math and science proficiency test scores (Figures 7.1-1 and 7.1-2), with performance levels for both tests meeting the proficiency standard across all student segments and the aggregate of performance nearing the national best. Similarly, results presented for the USAEP 8th grade reading and math proficiency tests (Figures 7.1-5 and 7.1-6) show continuing improvement in levels of performance, with current levels exceeding the comparable best and nearing the national best. These key student learning results, which may indicate that the applicant is making progress toward its vision of becoming a benchmark school district, may be related to the district's student-to-faculty ratio, which has decreased significantly from 2000 to 2003 (Figure 7.4-1). **SVI #1**
+	a	1-5	Le,T,C	Scores on the state test, the Anywhere Assessment of Educational Progress (AAEP), of 5th grade math (Figure 7.1-3), 5th grade reading (Figure 7.1-4), 11th grade reading (Figure 7.1-7), 11th grade writing (Figure 7.1-8), and 11th grade math (Figure 7.1-9) all show positive five-year trends with a diminishing gap among the student segments reported. These results show a continuing trend of improvement at or nearing state best, and in the case of 5th grade reading, exceeding the comparable best. **SVI #1**
+	a	1-5	Le,T,C	The district's PSAT results (Figure 7.9-11) demonstrate continued improvement in all student segments reported over the past five years, with current levels exceeding the comparable best. **SVI #3**
+	a	1-5	Le,T,Li	Results for the percentage of students using technology for active learning (Figure 7.1-13) show an increase over the past five years by as much as 25% for disadvantaged students, with similar gains for other student segments, and 2003 levels for some segments at or near the national best. Results for 8th grade technology competence (Figure 7.1-14) demonstrate similar positive levels, with four of the seven student segments reported at or exceeding the national best. These results are a favorable indication of the district's progress on its strategic challenge of integrating technology as a learning and decision-making tool. **SVI #3**
+	a	1-6	Le,T,C	The district demonstrates continued improvement over the last five years in its graduation rate (a key NCLB requirement), with its current level exceeding 90% (Figure 7.1-15). Only six percentage points below the national best, the district is on target for achieving its goal of a 96% graduation rate for all student groups. The district also illustrates its commitment to graduation

				for all students through its results on the AAEP High School Exit Exam (Figure 7.1-16), with passing rates for grades 8, 11, and 12 showing continuous improvement from 2001 through 2003 and exceeding the state best in 2003. Finally, the district shows continued improvement in NCS and GED graduation rates (Figure 7.1-17), with rates exceeding state best for the last two years. **SVI #2**
+	a	1-5	Le,T,C	The district, which serves more than 1,200 students from 64 countries, shows favorable levels and trends related to the performance of its ESL students. In the areas of reading and math (Figures 7.1-18 and 7.1-19), performance for students in their first and second year of the ESL program improved significantly from 1999 through 2003, with 80% of second-year students at grade level in 2003 (exceeding the state best). **SVI #2**

– /– –	Item Ref.	KF Ref.	Le/T/C /Li/ G	Opportunities for Improvement (Include figure references, as appropriate.)
--	a	1-5	G	Although the district identifies special education students as a primary subgroup of students, no results are provided on their performance. For example, there are no data on their grade-level proficiency, completion of Individual Education Plan (IEP) goals, or graduation rates. Without such information, the district may have difficulty assessing the success of its instructional practices for these students or planning improvements to better meet their needs. **SVI #3**
-	a	1-5	Le,T,C	Although the applicant states that results for students in Region 3, a pocket of poverty within the district, improved significantly in grade 8 math and science from 1999 to 2003, no comparative information is presented on the other regions' performance levels. Without such information, it may be difficult to assess the significance of the Region 3 results. Also, although results for disadvantaged students on the USAEP 8th grade reading and math tests (Figures 7.1-5 and 7.1-6) show that their performance has improved from 1999 to 2003, their performance levels still fall below the 80% passage rate required for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). **SVI #1**

Site Visit Issues (For Stage 3, Site Visit Use)

Scoring Range Resulting from Site Visit Findings (From the Scoring Guidelines) _____

Change from Consensus: ____ higher range ____ same range ____ lower range

Item Worksheet—Item 7.1 **Percent Score**

Guidance on completing Results Site Visit Issue Worksheets

The objective of this example is to demonstrate how to effectively address two OFIs from different Items (Item 7.1 and 4.1) and a Key Theme, as well as to provide the Judges with the interpretation of updated results presented by the applicant at Site Visit. This approach enables you to minimize the total number of SVIs while ensuring that OFIs are clarified and Key Themes explored.

Another key aspect of Results Items SVIs is the need for you, as the examiner, to spend adequate time with the applicant to fully explore the updated results that are presented. The Judges receive the updated results, so it is not necessary to reproduce them in your SVI worksheets. However, any data that is reviewed on Site Visit that goes beyond the updated results must be summarized and explained as outlined below.

In reviewing Results Items, what is necessary—no, critical—is for you to describe the impact on scoring of any changes in results that have occurred since the original application was submitted (e.g., positive or negative effect on trends, changes in comparative data from average to Best in Class, one poor-performing component,

measures changed, but still not aligned with key customer groups). For instance, it may be that the changes are the result of normal (random) variation and have no practical significance either positive or negative. Similarly, the changes may be the result of expected cyclicality in the underlying process. Changes in results may be due also to favorable or unfavorable changes in the economy or the larger environment beyond the applicant's immediate control. On the other hand, changes in performance may be the result of the applicant's improved or degraded process performance. Without your work as an Examiner, exploring these possibilities with the applicant, and documenting the conclusions on the SVI worksheets (and later reflected potentially in amended comments and revised scoring), the Judges have no way to make a fair decision regarding the applicant's updated results.

Another way to help explain the context by which changes in the results should be interpreted is to relate the importance of the result back to one or more of the applicant's Key Factors. For example, an OFI that appeared significant during Consensus may be legitimately found to be insignificant once the true nature of the applicant's Key Factors can be validated on site. What may also occur is that an ambiguous result shown in the application that previously had not been commented upon takes on new significance at site. In this instance, a new SVI should be created to help the Judges understand how this new issue emerged.

This approach often results in a rather long SVI worksheet. Findings should include a summary of the additional data (outside of the updated results), details of the strategy used to explore the meaning of the results, and conclusions that clearly link back to the strategy and findings. Finally, the conclusions should show how this exploration has been captured in revised or new comments, changes to related Key Themes, and any recommended changes to scoring bands.

Site Visit Issue Worksheet (Record only one issue per page.)

Item Reference: 7.1a-1 *Not originally evaluated at consensus* _____

Issue: Verify the district's student learning results (7.1-7.9) and clarify the results, segmentation, and comparisons for the district's disadvantaged students and for Region 3 on the USAEP 8th Grade Reading and Math Scores, Figures 7.1-5 and 7.1-6.

Comment(s) affected: (An SVI addresses one or more comments in the consensus scorebook so that by the end of the site visit all OFI's, double pluses, and strength comments linked to a key theme in the final scorebook have been verified or clarified. List the comments found in the consensus scorebook that are addressed by the findings and conclusions concerning this issue, *e.g., 1.1 first +, 1.1 first OFI, KTa.2, and 5.3 second +*)

Item 7.1, OFI #2
Key Theme c #2
Item 4.1, OFI #2

Strategy: (What information do you need, and how do you intend to obtain it, i.e., persons to interview, specific questions to ask each person [including walk-around questions to check deployment], specific documents to review and for what purpose, and observations to make? Be sure your strategy will address the overall issue as well as the comments listed above.)

1. Verify sustained performance levels and trend lines by requesting updates for Figures 7.1 through 7.9. (KT c#2)

2. Interview Item 7.1 Lead, Dr. John Tremain. In reviewing updated data from Item 7.1, ask for comparisons among the Regions. Also ask if other results exist (not provided in the application) which might show comparative results for the District's disadvantaged. (7.1 OFI #2, 4.1 OFI #2)

3. Ask for a sample of how the aggregated results for disadvantaged students break down to the middle school level, e.g. District – Regional – Middle School. (7.1 OFI #2, 4.1 OFI #2)

Findings: (What observations, specific answers, and/or updated results did you find during the site visit? Be specific and include data as appropriate.)

1. Reviewing updated results along with documentation for prior years, results for math and reading are confirmed as reported and trends continue upward to the present. Although the school had results for writing and science at some grade levels, test results do not include the robust comparisons the district uses for math and reading.

Performance levels for disadvantaged students on the 8th grade reading proficiency are at 78% and fall below the 80% passage rate required for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). Performance levels for disadvantaged students on the 8th grade math proficiency do meet the 80% passage rate required for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) at the district level (81%). Region 3 disadvantaged students, while showing a strong improvement trend, still fall below the 80% passage rate (78%).

2. 7.1 Lead, Dr. John Tremain, provided comparative, segmented data for Regions 1-5. Results indicate the math proficiency for 8th grade Region 3 disadvantaged students trended upward from 20% to 78% from 1999 to the present, while the district overall trended upward from 55% to 81% in the same period. Results for disadvantaged students at Andrew Carroway Middle School (Region 3) showed much better results at the beginning of the trend period than other schools with disadvantaged students, indicating 47% math proficiency in 1999 and 51% in 2000. Dr. Tremain explained how the segmentation of the data enabled the District to recognize the differences among disadvantaged students in various schools. They identified Carroway M.S. as an internal benchmark that was performing effectively with disadvantaged students, transferred its best practices to other schools, and thus improved performance among disadvantaged students at a faster rate than the overall District.

3. Results were presented by Dr. Tremain demonstrating how data are disaggregated from the District's results to school level results. Results were segmented by region, within each region, and by school.

Conclusions: (What is the resolution of this site visit issue based on your findings? For each comment referenced in "Comments affected" indicate 1) the action you will take, e.g., delete/modify/no change; 2) the specific findings that lead you to that action, and 3) the final wording of the comment as it will appear in the site visit scorebook. If a new comment is required it should be included in this section as well.)

1. Math and reading results are confirmed, however science and writing results were dropped from the comment.

Consensus scorebook key theme c #2 originally read:

The district's student learning results are good to excellent in almost all areas of importance, with sustained improvement trends evident in most areas presented. The district's performance is better than that of the comparable best school district in most areas, and it is equal to or better than the state best and nearing the national best in many areas. The results of summative assessments in reading, math, science, and writing across various grade levels show that the performance of the district's students is improving across student segments. In addition, the district's AYP performance approaches the national best (Figure 7.6-6) and is significantly ahead of the No Child Left Behind goal of all schools achieving AYP by 2013.

Revised key theme c#2 is:

The district's student learning results are good to excellent in almost all areas of importance, with sustained improvement trends evident in most areas presented. The district's performance is better than that of the comparable best school district in most areas, and it is equal to or better than the state best and nearing the national best in many areas. The results of summative assessments in reading and math across various grade levels show that the performance of the district's students is improving across student segments. In addition, the district's AYP performance approaches the national best (Figure 7.6-6) and is significantly ahead of the No Child Left Behind goal of all schools achieving AYP by 2013.

2 and 3. As a result of findings, the 1st and 2nd sentences of 7.1 OFI #2, will be dropped—comparative information was provided and the district's statement is confirmed. The third sentence will be clarified to create a revised OFI and a strength will be added.

Consensus scorebook comment:

Although the applicant states that results for students in Region 3, a pocket of poverty within the district, improved significantly in grade 8 math from 1999 to 2003, no comparative information is presented on the other regions' performance levels. Without such information, it may be difficult to assess the significance of the Region 3 results. Also, although results for disadvantaged students on the USAEP 8th grade math tests (Figures 7.1-5 and 7.1-6) show that their performance has improved from 1999 to 2003, their performance levels still fall below the 80% passage rate required for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

Revised OFI:

Although results for Region 3 disadvantaged students show a strong improvement trend for disadvantaged students in 8th grade reading and math proficiency, the performance levels are at 78% and 78%, respectively, below the 80% passage rate required for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

New strength:

In Region 3, a pocket of poverty within the district, results for disadvantaged students in 8th grade math proficiency improved significantly from 1999 to the present, improving at a faster rate (from 20% to 78%) than the district overall in the same time period (from 55% to 81%).

2 and 3. Also as a result of findings, 4.1 OFI #2, will be removed; and a strength will replace it.

The consensus scorebook OFI:

It is not clear how the applicant effectively uses comparative data at the region, building, and classroom levels to support operational decision making and innovation.

The new strength comment:

The applicant uses comparative data at the district, region, and school levels to support operational decision making and innovation. For example, the district transferred best practices from Andrew Carroway Middle School to other middle schools in Region 3 as a strategy to improve math proficiency. The faster rate of improvement for Region 3 Disadvantaged students in math proficiency (20%-78% from 1999-YTD) versus the district's overall results in math proficiency (55%-81% from 1999-YTD) may indicate that the applicant uses comparative, segmented data for operational and strategic making

relative to a key education and learning challenge (P.2b).

The site visit findings indicate that the processes and/or results investigated would have the following effect on scoring:

raise___ , no effect on ___ , or lower___ the consensus evaluation.

Site Visit Issue Worksheet